



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/831,845	04/01/97	CALDER	B P2167/SUN1P1

HICKMAN BEYER & WEAVER  
PO BOX 61059  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

LM12/0229

EXAMINER

BULLOCK JR, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2755

DATE MAILED:

02/29/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**08/831,845**Applicant(s)  
**Calder, Bartley H. et al.**Examiner  
**Lewis Bullock, Jr.**Group Art Unit  
**2755**

## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Feb 11, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☐ The proposed amendment(s):
- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
  - ☐ will not be entered because:
    - ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
    - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
    - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
    - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_


- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Attachment.
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  
Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claims rejected: 1-23
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other

Art Unit: 2755

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed 2/11/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the data handler mechanism is separately maintained from the mapping mechanism, however there is no such limitation in the claim language. The examiner must use the broadest possible reasoning in examining the claims. Applicant also argues that Skeen's service discipline routine (command object) does not operate on the data as claimed. Skeen teaches each service discipline examines service records and establishes communications with services (Col. 18, lines 60-64; Col. 19, lines 62-65). It is therefore implied that the service discipline must interpret the data (operate on the data) in order to know where to send the request for communication to. Applicant also argues that a service discipline is not returned to an application. Skeen teaches that the service discipline passes retrieved data to the application (Col. 20, lines 28-35) through the call back routine. It is therefore obvious that the application has some address indication of the service discipline returning it information. Skeen also teaches that service disciplines can be directly mapped by an application (Col. 20, lines 48-63). Therefore, it is obvious that the application must have an address or pointer to the service discipline it would like to invoke for communication. Applicant also argues that the Skeen does not teach a single communications interface which interfaces with a plurality of applications. Skeen teaches that communication interfaces are accessed by users groups which comprise of a plurality of users (Col. 8, lines 1-14). It is obvious that a user could be an accessing application.

  
MAJID A. BANANKHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER